DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 463 651 FL 027 214

AUTHOR Tuzi, Frank
TITLE E-Feedback's Impact on ESL Writers' Revisions.
PUB DATE 2001-03-00
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) (St. Louis, MO, February 27-March 3, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Bound Students; *Computer Uses in Education; *English (Second Language); Evaluation Methods; *Feedback; Internet; *Peer Evaluation; *Revision (Written Composition); Second Language Learning; Secondary Education; Student Evaluation; *Writing Skills

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a method of investigating the role and impact of electronic peer/teacher feedback on the revision process of English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) writers. Participants are classes of intermediate or advanced college bound ESL writers who meet in Internet-accessible classrooms. They perform their writing and peer responses online during class. Students and instructors receive coaching on effective response concepts at the beginning of the semester. They also receive training in technology use. Writers produce three different essays during the semester with at least two revisions per essay. After the writer drafts and posts each essay online, teachers and peers read the drafts and write and post their responses directly in the browser, and the writers revise their papers. All data are analyzed as they are received. Drafts are analyzed using a rubric adapted from Hall's research analysis (1990). The rubric includes three categories (level, type, and purpose of revision). Peer and teacher responses to using electronic collaborative software are evaluated. Interviews are conducted throughout the semester. ESL writers who receive feedback indicate that they see the benefits of electronic feedback, which impacts revisions, provides detailed written comments, and alters writing pressure. (Contains 65 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 463 651

E-feedback's impact on ESL writers' revisions

Frank Tuzi - Indiana University of Pennsylvania
ftuzi@yahoo.com

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frank Tuzi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL027214

E-feedback's impact on ESL writers' revisions

Frank Tuzi - Indiana University of Pennsylvania
ftuzi@yahoo.com

The history of peer response groups in L2 writing contains ardent supporters and severe critics. There are those who have nothing but good things to say about peer response. Mittan(1989), for example, praises the use of peer response groups and cites a variety of benefits to support their use. Others describe peer response groups as limiting students' writing abilities and causing potential harm (Carson & Nelson, 1996; Zhang, 1995; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Leki, 1990). The research to date indicates that there are benefits to using peer response groups as well as problems that result from their use. Neither of these groups, however, has considered the growing influence of technology on the writing process. This research takes a first step to investigate the role and impact of electronic peer/teacher feedback on the revision process.

The benefits of peer response

Supporters of peer response groups cite a number of benefits to using collaborative writing activities. Carson & Nelson (1994) and Mendonca & Johnson(1994) support response groups by quoting the Vygotskyan theory that cognitive development comes from social interaction. Response groups can also be a catalyst to L2 development (Mangelsdorf, 1989; Mittan, 1989). Villamil & DeGuerrero's (1996) research also described the social behaviors during the peer revision process. They concluded that collaborative writing groups are a complex process that foster a myriad of communication activities including collaboration, taking and relinquishing authority and providing scaffolding. The students in this study tried to establish a working environment that contained camaraderie and compromise. These results are based on oral response, however, and although electronic feedback (e-feedback) employs some of these complex communication activities, they operate at a greatly reduced intensity, especially asynchronic e-feedback. Thus, social behaviors like taking and relinquishing authority are less intense because the revision process in not being conducted in a real-time, face to face meeting. Because e-feedback is not a real-time, face to face activity, students may not ask questions or request restatements to avoid lengthening the conversation. It is possible to theorize that e-feedback, by its very structure, limits the communication activities that were discovered in oral response studies. Studies that focus on the social behaviors and interaction of L2 writers in an electronic environment, however, do not yet exist. This research proposal will investigate how L2 writers respond and how those responses impact subsequent revision.

Another benefit of response groups, increased participation, allows students to participate in a variety of different activities during the writing process including establishing low risk-communication, developing a clearer understanding of what the audience needs to know, building critical reading skills, developing skills to analyze their own writing, and encouraging the idea of writing as a process. (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994, Mittan, 1989; Witbeck, 1976).

In summary, oral-based feedback increases participation and interaction among L2 writers, which include more opportunities for negotiating meaning, scaffolding, developing critical reading and analyzing writing skills, recognizing audience needs, and encouraging writing as a process. Oral-based feedback also increased opportunities for practicing social interaction skills like turn taking, collaboration, and taking and relinquishing authority.

The drawbacks of peer response

Although there are benefits put forth in the literature, there are also a number of criticisms against response groups being used in L2 writing.

Carson & Nelson (1996) described the effects of a student's cultural background on his collaboration in groups. Their research suggests that students whose culture values harmony (China, Japan) will seek to keep harmony within a group while students who come from a more individualistic cultures (United States, Mexico) may sacrifice group harmony in favor of helping an individual achieve their personal goal. When these two groups of students form a peer response

ED427214

group, conflicts may arise. Thus, culturally mixed groups may experience problems when responding to a partner's writing because of different expectations and communication styles.

Zhang (1995) focuses on another criticism: blindly accepting the research from L1 studies for use in L2 writing. Zhang cautions L2 writing teachers about the affective benefits of peer feedback. He conducted a survey and discovered that "claims made about the affective advantage of peer feedback in L1 writing do not apply to ESL writing" (p. 218). Unlike L1 writers who have native language knowledge at their disposal, L2 writers have limited access to the target language, and therefore rely on the expertise of the teacher (Pratt, 1999). Because ESL students overwhelmingly value teacher feedback (Curtis, 1997; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Paulus, 1999), Zhang concluded that L2 writing teachers should be wary of applying L1 research results to L2 writing classes where students often bring different ideas about intervention and revision to the writing class. Jacobs, Curtis, Braine and Huang (1998) advocate using a "middle path" to feedback where L2 writing teachers incorporate teacher, peer and self-feedback. Ferris & Hedgcock (1998) rightly conclude that "Given the multiple sources of feedback . . . it is not surprising that students would utilize all of them, nor is it particularly shocking that they would appear to pay more attention to the teacher's feedback" (p. 174).

A final criticism regarding oral peer response groups is what effect they have on the revision process. A number of studies investigated how oral feedback influences subsequent revision (Berg, 1999; Paulus, 1999; Connor & Asenavage 1994; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Berger, 1990). Although the results of these studies are somewhat conflicting, two patterns have emerged.

One pattern focused on the types of revision that students made, which were generally meaning-preserving changes to papers on both the surface and meaning levels (Paulus, 1999; Hedgecock & Lefkowicz, 1992; Hall, 1990; Gaskill, 1986).

Another recurring pattern is that the changes that L2 writers tend to focus too heavily on surface errors in oral response groups (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger's, 1992; Berger, 1990; Leki, 1990). Students can also feel uncertain about the value of their partner's responses. Most likely one student will have superior writing skills and will doubt the responses of students who have less advanced skills. Another reason for this feeling of uncertainty may lie in the fact that some students offer vague comments that do not assist the writer (Leki, 1990).

This problem is compounded even further in an electronic environment where the ability to negotiate meaning, and interpret the dialogue is limited to written text. Berg, Hall and Stanley did not consider the impact of e-feedback on the response and revision process. In the oral response setting that Hall and Berg used, writers and responders communicated verbally and nonverbally in real-time as well as employed the printed text, which both could view, refer to and mark up. They also negotiated meaning in real-time. The electronic environment, however, has a different setting; non-verbal communication is lost as is the ability to view and mark up text in real-time. It is also more difficult to negotiate meaning due to the span of time between messages. So communicating via the filter of writing increases the need for respondents to articulate their intended meaning without the benefits of nonverbal communication and visual aids, and increases the need for L2 writers to decipher the responder's intended meaning using only written response as they try to notice discrepancies in their own writing. It is important to discover whether limiting the modes of communication to written messages is a benefit or a deterrent for L2 writers. There have been no studies that investigated the impact of e-feedback on L2 writers' abilities to perceive the incongruities in their writing with their intended meaning or to evaluate the way in which e-feedback can provide alternatives for the L2 writer. This study will investigate the influence that e-feedback has on L2 writers' ability to perceive differences in their writing from their intended meaning as well as study how e-feedback supplies L2 writers with possible alternatives.

ESL researchers focus on a variety of peer response aspects, but they have one thing in common: the belief that it is important to prepare students to participate in peer response activities

(Berg, 1999; Tannacito, 1999; Conner & Asenavage, 1994; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Stanley, 1992; Mittan, 1989; Witbeck, 1976). Stanley (1992) spent much time training students to be effective peer evaluators and the result of his study were confident students who demonstrated greater ability to offer specific, meaning-level feedback.

Similarly, Berg (1999) states that if the goal of inexperienced writers is to develop a better revision, then L2 writers must sharpen their skills in perceiving these incongruities and in formulating viable alternatives, an ability strengthened by training. Additionally, Hall (1990) states that the ability to revise develops and improves when L2 writers confront and resolve problems in their own writing. And peer/teacher response can affect revision by indicating an unclear text, and subsequently offer alternatives. Training peers to be effective peer evaluators will increase the likelihood that they will be able to produce the intended focus on meaning, as well as assisting L2 writers to perceive mismatches, and provide alternatives.

To summarize, L2 writers adopt a variety of stances and discuss a variety of issues during a peer review. Although students value their peers' responses and may make revisions as a result of peer responses, they nonetheless prefer teacher feedback. Student revision based on peer response tends to be in the form of eliminating surface errors. Training students to be effective peer evaluators who focus on specific, idea-based, meaning-level feedback can influence L2 writers' writing proficiency.

Although research on oral/peer feedback for L2 writers indicates benefits and drawbacks, it did not consider the electronic environment as a locale for communicating. Just as Zhang (1995) cautioned L2 writing instructors not to blindly accept the research from L1 studies, so I question whether the benefits of oral feedback will transfer to e-feedback. I am unsure whether the depth of communication will increase or whether the responses L2 writers receive will assist them in generating quality drafts. These doubts exist because there are distinct differences between oral and written feedback and because little research on the effects that e-feedback has on L2 writers and the writing process has been published.

Differences between oral feedback and e-feedback

Fundamental differences between oral and written feedback exist that casts doubt on whether e-feedback retains the benefits discovered in oral feedback. These differences, some of are summarized in table 1, may actually encourage writers and instructors to keep their responses in face-to-face settings. Oral feedback, for example, is replete with nonverbal and intonational information that is transmitted during a conversation. These language elements assist everyone in deciphering, understanding, and negotiating meaning. E-feedback does not transmit these beneficial elements. In addition, negotiating meaning, which typically occurs in the fast paced environment of real-time communication, is a vital communicative process that is hampered by the time delays between messages. In other words, L2 writers using e- feedback may not be able to participate in the myriad of communication activities in traditional oral response because the nonverbal elements are missing, because there is a time delay involved in the dialog, and because the added writing filter in e-feedback makes encoding and deciphering messages more difficult. Additionally, the greater sense of anonymity may discourage a sense of community in some students, which can also stymie scaffolding.

Table 1

Differences between oral and e-feedback

Oral feedback	E-feedback
Face-face	Distant
Oral	Written
Time dependent	Time independent
Pressure to quickly respond	No pressure to quickly respond
Place dependent	Place independent

Non-verbal components	No non-verbal components
More personally intrusive	More personally distant
Oral/cultural barriers	Written/cultural barriers
A greater sense of involvement	A greater sense of anonymity

Warschauer (1997) suggested that, "the special features of online communication--that it is text-based and computer-mediated, many-to-many, time- and place-independent, and distributed via hypermedia links--provide an impressive array of new ways to link learners" (p. 475), and although e-feedback is a potentially powerful tool for collaborative writing under certain circumstances, because e-feedback and oral feedback are generated, transmitted, received and deciphered differently, the benefits evident in oral feedback may not exist in e-feedback. Further studies need to be conducted to investigate whether the benefits of oral based feedback also exist in e-feedback.

Technology-based collaborative writing research

Several researchers have discussed the benefits of developing peer response writing. Warschauer, the most prolific writer on technology and L2 writing, has conducted research revealing a number of benefits for incorporating TBCW to L2 writing. One benefit was increased participation. Whereas 30% to 40% of students participated in face-to-face peer response, there was an 80%-100% participation ratio with electronic discourse (Warschauer, 1996; Sullivan and Pratt, 1996). At the same time the role of the teacher decreased and her position as teacher was transformed at times to that of another voice in the online discussion. Finally, students used more formal language in an electronic environment (Warschauer, 1996b).

Sullivan and Pratt's study(1996) suggests that L2 writing students receive more focused responses from peer evaluators using computers than from face-to-face peer evaluators. Many of the responses contained similar comments, which may reinforce the need for the author to revise that particular section of his paper. Their research, however, did not study the relationship between the suggestions respondents made and their impact on the revisions writers developed. The main goal of this research is to explore the relationship between peer/teacher e-feedback and their effect on L2 writers' revisions.

Sullivan and Pratt (1996) suggest that another benefit of using TBCW is the increase in writing practice. Because their discussion is text-based, L2 writers get more practice in communicating through writing. The increase in participation and writing ability is evident from the fact that more suggestions emerged from electronic discourse. Sullivan and Pratt suggest that the longer students are engaged in electronic discussion, the greater the effect on their writing skills.

In summary, TBCW increases the amount of student participation, reduces the role of the teacher, increases the students writing practice time, and provides multiple and redundant responses for students.

These benefits seem to mirror some of the advantages discovered in oral feedback, but they do not indicate the type and quality of that participation. Negotiating meaning, creating scaffolding, and recognizing audience needs for example were not considered in these studies. Nor did these studies evaluate whether e-feedback increased opportunities for practicing social interaction skills like turn taking, collaboration, and taking and relinquishing authority. Finally these studies did not analyze the impact of the e-feedback on subsequent drafts. This research focuses on the impact e-feedback has on ESL writers' revisions.

Clearly there has been an extensive amount of research on oral response and revision in L2 writing. However, research on the influence of TBCW on L2 writing and revision is still in its infancy. It has not been determined whether the benefits and drawbacks of oral feedback exist within a text-based, e-feedback system. Specifically, there have been no studies that have investigated the effects of e-feedback on L2 writers and on their revisions.

This study, motivated by previous studies in TBCW and L2 revision, focuses on the relationship between peer and teacher electronic feedback and their affect on L2 writers' revisions. In order to more fully explore that relationship, I developed a number of questions.

1. How does peer/teacher e-feedback influence the L2 writer's ability to perceive differences in his writing from his intended meaning?
2. How does peer/teacher e-feedback help supply L2 writer's with possible alternatives for needed revisions in his papers?
3. What kinds of revisions do L2 writers make as a result of peer/teacher e-feedback?
4. How does peer/teacher electronic feedback affect L2 writers' revision in a multi-draft process-approach writing environment?
5. Do e-feedback and revisions differ between L2 writers from different cultures?

Method

Theoretical design

Two major factors influenced the design of this research. A strong motivating factor is my personal views on research which fall somewhat in line with Miles & Huberman's perspective (1994). Miles & Huberman take Lincoln & Guba's (1985) naturalistic paradigm and the traditional quantitative paradigm and incorporate them into what I call the middle way. Miles and Huberman do not reject in total the traditional paradigm. Instead they embrace much of the naturalistic paradigm and at the same time recognize the benefits of the traditional paradigm. The mixing of these two philosophical poles means that I can take advantage of both methodologies. I recognize the advantages of using both perspectives. Schrag (1992) points out that any paradigm will seek a causal relationship and will therefore accept in some form the positivist ideology. Potter (1996) also recognizes that few positivists deny the benefits of subjectivity. Both paradigms offer pluses and minuses, and I seek to take advantage of the plusses. With this in mind, I plan to conduct this study in a natural setting. This study incorporates an emergent design and subjective data collection from human subjects in the form of interviews and observation coupled with the analysis of the revisions and the questionnaire.

In addition to philosophical influences, I also decided on a taxonomy for analyzing the drafts. Several taxonomies currently exist, the most popular being the taxonomy designed by Faigley and Witte (1981). Faigley and Witte developed a system for evaluating revisions using a two layered design that looks for surface changes and text-base changes. However, I didn't think that their taxonomy was specific enough. For example, Severinson-Eklundh & Kollberg (1996) argued that the word substitution, which Faigley and Witte use in the taxonomy is ambiguous. It is unclear whether the substitution is merely a deletion followed by an addition or whether it is a linguistic replacement (p. 174). I also sensed the Faigley and Witte taxonomy lacked sufficient detailed analysis for the purposes of this study. Eklundh and Kollberg also developed a taxonomy for analyzing revision, but their rubric contained more detail than this study required. For example, their rubric included an analysis of keystrokes and the manner of inputting text and revisions. I choose to develop a taxonomy based on Hall's revision analysis rubric (1990). Hall attempted to develop a more specific taxonomy by developing a multi-layered approach to revision analysis that included the time, level, type and purpose of revision. This level of detail in the analysis process is somewhere in between Faigley and Witte's rubric and Eklundh and Kollberg's design, and is therefore, easier to modify to this study. The modified version of Hall's taxonomy, which is described in the data collection procedures section of this proposal, is only a starting point of analysis. As I collect and analyze the data, other patterns will emerge that will encourage me to modify the taxonomy to accommodate the emerging data patterns..

Setting

The participants will be enrolled in a semester long writing course that meets two or three times a week. The class will meet in an Internet accessible classroom. The teacher will use this room to instruct the students, conduct class activities and allow students to write, respond, and revise. Participants will perform their writing and peer responses online using these computers during class. The participants will enter all of their writings (drafts, essay, peer responses) into these

computers. This writing course will either be part of an intensive English program (IEP) or a freshman English composition course designed for ESL students. The teacher and researcher will decide how often and how long students will use the TBCW.

Participants

The participants include an intermediate or advanced writing class of between 30 and 50 college bound ESL writers, the teacher and the researcher as a participant observer.

The L2 writers will have some experience using computers. Most have little experience in writing academic compositions prior to entering this study. Additionally, in order to collect data on whether e-feedback and revisions differ between L2 writers from different cultures, the native cultures of these participants will come from a number of locations (e.g. European, Asian, etc.).

The instructor will have experience in teaching L2 writers and some experience using computers for teaching writing.

The researcher will take on the role of a participant observer, attending most of the class meetings. He will observe and participate in classroom activities and will assume responsibilities for coaching the L2 writers in writing effective responses. Moreover, the researcher will be the main technical advisor for the class, who will train the participants on the use of the technology, and will act as the technical assistant for technology related difficulties.

Coaching and training

Following the research of Berg (1999) and Stanley (1992), the students and the instructor will receive coaching on effective response concepts at the beginning of the semester to establish an understanding of appropriate and effective response writing. According to many researchers, it is important to prepare students to participate in peer response so that students are confident in their response abilities and can demonstrate the ability to offer specific, meaning-level feedback (Berg, 1999; Tannacito, 1999; Conner & Asenavage, 1994; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Stanley, 1992; Mittan, 1989; Witbeck, 1976). Coaching will include introducing and familiarizing evaluators with the process approach to essay writing and with effective responding concepts. Coaching involves more than simply instructing and modeling appropriate responses. The students and teacher will actually practice on previously written multiple draft essays in small groups. As they walk through the process, the students will be able to get first hand experience in responding. They will learn to respond to meaning first and to form in later drafts as well as to learn the proper tact that should accompany a response. Coaching will take place at the beginning of the semester and will take approximately five hours to complete.

In addition to the response coaching, the participants will receive training in the use of technology. Students will receive hands-on practice using an Internet browser and practice and instructions for logging onto and using the TBCW website during the first week. They will also practice using the discussion board and post messages regarding their technology and writing experiences. Training and practice with technology will take approximately 2 hours at the beginning of the semester. The training and practice time will be dispersed over several class meetings.

Syllabus design

The teacher and the researcher will work together to develop the major components of the syllabus. Although the location and instructor have not been determined, I offer a probable breakdown of the syllabus here.

Tasks

The writers in this research will produce three different essays during the semester with at least two revisions per essay. The individual teacher will control how essay topics are determined. She may choose the topics herself or allow the L2 writers to choose.

After the L2 writer drafts and posts each essay online, their peers and teacher will read the drafts and then write and post their response directly in the browser. The writers will then revise their papers.

Schedule

Before classes actually begin, the researcher will interview the instructor regarding her thoughts and feelings about the project.

During the first week, the researcher will introduce the research project to the L2 writers and ask them to participate in the study by signing a waiver. During the first five weeks the researcher will use approximately one and a half hours a week for training students to use the technology and coaching them on the effective creation of responses. Students will receive about five hours of coaching practice and two hours for technical training. The remaining time during these five weeks will be devoted to the development of the first writing project. The first writing project will not be evaluated in this research, but instead will be used to acclimate writers to the technology and the concepts of collaborative response. While essay development ensues the researcher will observe the L2 writers and conduct spot interviews.

During the next nine weeks, the L2 writers will develop 3 more essays using the format and skills learned from the first writing project. The researcher will attend classes, participate in classrooms activities, assist in technical problems, make observations and conduct spot interviews.

Throughout the semester the researcher will conduct a number of face-to-face interviews with L2 writers and the instructor to investigate their reasons for the revisions they made and discuss the influence the e-feedback on their revision choices. The interview process and analysis is described in the data analysis section.

Software

There are several technology based collaborative writing (TBCW) software packages on the market. The first major package was the Daedalus project (1989), which allows students to do prewriting activities, participate in real-time conferencing, and post responses on electronic bulletin boards. Commonspace from Sixth Floor Media is another program that allows users to interact to create and revise documents (1998). This program allows users to create multiple columns on-screen for attaching comments and voice annotations to a document, and can be used on a local network, or through the Internet allowing L2 writers from any distance to collaborate on their writing. A recently developed package is Connect Textra by Norton & Company (1999). Using Connect and Microsoft Word (1997), teachers and students can read students' writings, post or embed responses, create or join real-time response groups, send personal or global messages, and edit their own writing. A big advantage to this system is that setting up the program is free for the university or teacher. Students pay a one-time fee to receive an access ID, and then they can take an unlimited number of classes using this software. The College Writing Peer Response Project (CWPRP) was a recent project that allowed that writers to post essays on the Internet and anyone could read and respond using an electronic mail form. The obvious advantage with this project is that the materials are online and accessible from anywhere the Internet is available.

Although these TBCW packages are worthwhile programs and might serve the purposes of this research, a number of factors encouraged me to reject them for use in this study. One consideration was cost. Some programs like WebCT cost the university upwards of $3500 to use their site. Other packages like Commonspace require a copy of the software be placed on every computer that will access the program and charge $100 per copy. Another consideration was the ease of use. Some packages like the CWPRP required the use additional computer expertise that typical L2 writers lack. TBCW software packages that included special setup for teachers or administrators also discouraged me from selecting them.

An important determiner for selecting software was whether the mode of communication was synchronous or asynchronous. Synchronous or real-time communication re-introduces the pressure for a quick response, and encourages students to provide "shoot from the hip" responses instead of a more contemplated, thought through response. Thus systems like Daedalus and WebCT that

incorporate synchronous response as the primary mode of e-feedback were not considered for this project.

The final consideration for software selection has more to do with my personal philosophy of software use than the effectiveness or appropriateness of the software. All of the TBCW software packages created so far do not incorporate a philosophy I embrace: Open source. Open source is the belief that software should be available at no cost and that users have the right to modify the source code. Thus, I plan to develop collaborative writing software that will adhere to Open Source philosophy. The program I hope to develop will run through a standard web browser and will allow users to create multiple columns on-screen for drafting, responding and revising. In the event that I do not have the time or capabilities to develop this application, I will resort to using Norton's Textra. Textra is inexpensive, integrates with MS Word, incorporates both synchronous and asynchronous communication, and more closely resembles open source than any other TBCW currently available.

For this study the participants will interact via the Internet. The programs they will need to use include an email system, an electronic discussion board, and a web browser. The discussion board will be used to discuss class readings and post problems or questions students may have. Unlike Sullivan and Pratt (1999), who used real-time discussion, I chose to employ an electronic discussion board because they provide participants time to think about what they want to write. Participants will use the web browser to input, edit, and view essays and e-feedback. Essentially, the web browser will contain and manage the TBCW software program.

Data collection procedures

During the course of this research, the researcher will collect the drafts, responses, observational field notes, and notes from interviews. Table 2 contains a summary of the research questions and their relation to the data collected.

Table 2

The relationship between the research questions and the collected data

Research Questions	The data used for this question
1. How does peer/teacher e-feedback influence the L2 writer's ability to perceive differences in his writing from his intended meaning?	Drafts, responses, field notes, interviews
2. How does peer/teacher e-feedback help supply L2 writers with possible alternatives for needed revisions in his papers?	Drafts, responses, field notes, interviews
3. How do peer/teacher e-feedback affect L2 writers' revisions in a multi-draft process-approach writing environment?	Drafts, responses, field notes, interviews
4. What kinds of revisions do L2 writers make as a result of peer/teacher e-feedback?	Drafts, responses, field notes, interviews
5. Do e-feedback and revisions differ between L2 writers from different cultures?	Drafts, responses, field notes, interviews

Data analysis

All data will be analyzed as it is received in order to establish a grounded theory. Constant comparison will allow me to incorporate my analysis of early data with new data as it becomes available, and thereby update the findings throughout the study. The analysis of the writings and responses juxtaposed with the interviews and observations will allow me to establish triangulation in this study. In addition to constant comparison and triangulation, much of the data will undergo a series of coding schemes.

The drafts

The drafts will be analyzed using a rubric adapted from Hall's research analysis (1990). The rubric is broken down into three categories: Level, type and purpose of revision. Table 3 contains a

summary of the rubric. The researcher will rate all of the documents, and a rater will evaluate approximately 15 percent of the documents to establish rater reliability.

Table 3

The essay analysis rubric for evaluating the revisions made by the L2 writers

Level of revision	Type of revision	Purpose of revision
Word, phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph, global, surface	Add, delete, substitute, reorder, consolidate	1. Grammar/mechanical 2. Adding informational 3. Preserving intended meaning 4. Other types of reasons to be determined as the data is collected

The analysis of the drafts will also include a comparison of the amount, level and types of revisions that students make to discover possible differences between L2 writers from different cultures.

The responses

The researcher will also evaluate the peer and teacher responses to determine how they responded using electronic collaborative software. The researcher will develop a rubric for analyzing the types of responses writers make based on Stanley's response analysis (1992) . Table 4 summarizes the analysis rubric for participant responses. Other response categories will be added to the rubric as new patterns emerge from the data.

Table 4

The participant analysis rubric used to evaluate the responses to the online drafts

Evaluator responses		Example
1.	Announces	"There is no conclusion here." or "Your main ideas is X."
2.	Points to	"You wrote XXXX. What do you mean by this?"
3.	Advises	"You might what to include an example here"
4.	Reacts	"This is a good example."
5.	Elicits writer response	"Davis, Do you think this supports your claim?"
6.	Collaborates/Alternatives	"You need a more specific claim. For example, XXXX."
7.	Questions	"What's the topic of your paper?" "Is this a logical response?"

The interviews

Interviews will be conducted throughout the semester. Some interviews will be impromptu in-class interviews with the students and teacher. Other, more formal interviews will be conducted using a stimulated recall format originally developed . Bloom (1950). After a revision has been posted, the researcher will lay out the revision and the responses the writer received and investigate how the e-feedback influenced the writer to make revisions, notice discrepancies and adopt alternatives into their revision.

Discussion

Data results

Course Specifications	
22	Students
	Essays Posted
297	Essays
185	Revisions
	Responses
244	Responses sent
575	Responses received

Reason for the changes (student interviews)	
1800	changes in the revisions
731	Self
263	Tutor / writing center
232	e-Feedback
198	Unknown
165	Oral
34	Notes

Impressions from ESL Writers receiving e-feeback
Benefits for ESL Writers

- Generally students see benefits to e-feeback
- E-feedback can and does impact revisions
- Provides detailed written comments
- Can free class time- time independent
- Provides extensive reading & writing
- Alters writing pressure
- Allows L2 writers to learn from other writers by expanding the audience

Implications for ESL Writing

- Generally prefer oral feedback
- Requires greater use of technology
- Requires students be taught how to respond
- E-feedback can be incorporated to aid the L2 writing
- Increases communication between students, courses, universities & cultures.

References

Berg, E. C. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. Journal of Second Language Writing, 8 (3), 215-241.

Berger, V. (1990). The effects of peer and self-feedback. CATESOL Journal. 3, 21-35.

Bloom, S. B. (1950). Problem solving processes of college students: An exploratory investigation. [Supplemental educational monographs]. The Elementary School Journal. 73.

Boswood, T., & Dwyer, R. (1995/1996). From marking to feedback: Audio-taped responses to Student Writing. TESOL Journal, 5 (2) 20-23.

Bridwell, L. S. (1980). Revising strategies in twelfth grade students' transactional writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 197-222.

Carson, J. G., & Nelson G. L.(1996) Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction, Journal of Second Language Writing, 5 (1), 1-1 9.

Charles, M. (1990). Responding to problems in written English using a student self-monitoring technique. ELT Journal, 44 (4), 286-293.

Chen, J. (1997). Computer generated error feedback and writing process: TESL-EJ, 2(3). Retrieved October, 10 1998 from the world wide web: http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/tesl-ej/ej07/a1.html.

Commonspace 3.0 [Computer Software]. (1999). Boston: MA. Sixth Floor Media , a Houghton Mifflin group.

Connor, U., & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? Journal of Second Language Writing, 3 (3), 257-276.

Cumming, A., & So, S. (1996). Tutoring second language text revision: Does approach to instruction or the language of communication make a difference? Journal of Second Language Writing, 5 (3), 197-226.

Curtis, A. (1997). Is it better to give than receive. Feedback in student writing. Paper presented at the World Skills: Language and Living conference, Victoria, British Columbia.

Daedalus Online [Computer software]. (1999). New York: Longman.

Evard, Michele. (1994). So please stop, thank you. Girls online. [Article posted on website]. Retrieved October, 10 1998 from the world wide web: http://mevard.www.media.mit.edu/people/mevard/papers/please-stop.html.

Faigley, L., & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. College, Composition and Communication, 32 (4), 400-413.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J.S. (1998). Teaching ESL composition: purpose, process and practice. Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D., (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. Journal of Second Language Writing,31 (2), 315-339.

Ferris, D., Pezone, S., Tade, C., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. Journal of Second Language Writing, 6 (2), 155-182.

Hall, C. (1990). Managing the complexity of revising across languages. TESOL Quarterly, 24 (1), 43-60.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback on L2 writing. Modern Language Journal, 80 (3), 287-308.

Hedgecock, J. & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in l2 composing, Journal of Second Language Writing, 3 (2), 141-163.

Hedgecock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. Journal of Second Language Writing, 1 (2), 255-276.

Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. Journal of Second Language Writing, 7 (3), 255-286.

Hyland, K. (1990). Providing productive feedback. ELT Journal, 44 (4), 279-285.

Jacobs, G.M., Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. Journal of Second Language Writing, 7 (3), 307-317.

Kepner, C. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second language writing skills. The Modern Language Journal, 75 (3), 305-313.

Kern, R. & Warschauer, M. (2000). Theory and practice of network-based language teaching. In M. Warschauer & R. Kern (Eds.), Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kozuma, R. B. (1991). Computer based writing tools and the cognitive needs of novice writers. Computers and Composition, 8 (2), 31-45.

Lazaraton, A. (1995). Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A progress report. TESOL Quarterly, 29, 455-472.

Leki, I. (1990). Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classes. CATESOL Journal, 3, 5-19.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. London: Sage Publications.

Mabrito, M. (1991). Electronic mail as a vehicle for peer response: Conversations of high and low apprehensive writers. Written Communication, 8 (4), 509-532.

Mangelsdorf K., & Schlumberger. (1992). ESL student response stances in a peer-review task Journal Of Second Language Writing, 1 (3), 235-254.

Mauriello, Nick, (1999). The College Peer Response Project.

Mendonça, C O., & Johnson K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. TESOL Quarterly, 28 (4), 745-769

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Mittan, R. (1989). The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D.M. Johnson, & D. H. Roen (Eds.) Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students (pp. 207-219). New York: Longman.

Mohan B., & Low, M. (1995). Collaborative teacher assessment of ESL writers: Conceptual and practical issues. TESOL Journal, 5 (1) 28-31.

Nelson, G.L., & Carson, J.G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. Journal of Second Language Writing, 7 (2), 113-131.

Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 8 (3) 265-289.

Phinney, M., & Khouri, S. (1993). Computers, revision, and ESL writers: The role of experience. Journal of Second Language Writing, 2 (3), 257-277.

Potter, J. W. (1996). An analysis of thinking and research about qualitative methods. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Pratt, E. (1999). A qualitative study of peer and teacher response in an ESL writing classroom in Puerto Rico. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Rada, R. (1998). Efficiency and effectiveness in computer-supported peer-peer learning computers. Education and Computers, 30 (31), 137-146.

Severinson-Eklundh, K & Kollberg, P (1996). A computer tool and framework for analyzing on-line revisions. In Levy, C. M. & Ransdell, S. (Eds.) The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications, (pp. 163-188). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schrag, F. (June--July 1992) In defense of positivist research paradigms. Educational Researcher 21 (5), 5-7.

Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. TESOL Quarterly, 27 (4), 657-677.

Sirc, G. (1989). Response in the electronic medium. In C. Anson (ed.) Writing and response: Theory, practice, and research (pp. 187-205). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Smagorinsky, P. & Cappock, J. (1994). Cultural Tools and the classroom context: An exploration of artistic response to literature. Written Communication. 11 (3), 283-310.

Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. Journal of Second Language Writing, 1 (3), 217-233.

Storch, N., & Tapper, J. (1997). Student annotations: What NNS and NS university students say about their own writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 6 (3), 245-264.

Sullivan, N., & Pratt, E. (1996). A comparative study of two ESL writing environments: A computer-assisted classroom and a traditional oral classroom. System, 24 (4), 491-501/

Tannacito, T. (1999). Electronic peer response groups: Case studies of computer mediated communication in a composition class. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Textra Connect [Computer software]. (1999). New York: New York. W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Villamil O. S., & DeGuerrero, M.C. M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. Journal of Second Language Writing, 5 (l), 51-75.

Warschauer, M. (1996). Comparing face-to-face and electronic discussion in the second language classroom. CALICO Journal, 13 (2), 7-26.

Warschauer, M. (1997).Computer-mediated collaborative learning: Theory and practice. Modern Language Journal, 81 (3), 470-481.

Warschauer, M. (1998). Interaction, negotiation, and computer-mediated learning. In M. Clay (Ed.), Practical applications of educational technology in language learning. Lyon, France: National Institute of Applied Sciences.

Warschauer, M. (1998). Researching technology in TESOL: Determinist, instrumental, and critical approaches. TESOL Quarterly, 32 (4), 757-761.

Warschauer, M., & Healey, D. (1998). Computers and language learning: An overview. Language Teaching, 31, 57-71.

Warschauer, M. (1995). E-mail for English teaching. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Warschauer, M. (1996). Motivational aspects of using computers for writing and communication. In Mark Warschauer (Ed.), Telecollaboration in foreign language learning: Proceedings of the Hawaii symposium. [Article posted on web site National foreign language resource center at the University of Hawaii at Manoa]. Retrieved October, 12 1998 from the world wide web: http://www.lll.hawaii.edu/nflrc/networks/nw1/

Witbeck, M.C. (1976). Peer correction procedures for intermediate and advanced ESL composition lessons, TESOL Quarterly, 10 (3) 321-326.

Word 7.0 [Computer Software]. (1997). Redmond: Washington. Microsoft Corporation.

Zhang, S. (1985). Responding to student writing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 79-102.

Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class, Journal of Second Language Writing, 4 (3), 209-222.

Zhang, S. (1999). Thoughts on some recent evidence concerning the affective advantage of peer feedback. Journal of Second Language Writing, 8 (3), 321-326.